UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/006,930	12/06/2001	John P. Del Favero JR.	770.02	9296

8685	7590	05/05/2005

DERGOSITS & NOAH LLP
FOUR EMBARCADERO CENTER, SUITE 1450
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111

EXAMINER
NGUYEN, MERILYN P

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2161	

DATE MAILED: 05/05/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _21 December 2004_.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
    closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1,2,5-10,12 and 14-33_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1,2,5-10,12 and 14-33_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on _06 December 2001_ is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
         application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☒ Other: _Detailed Action_.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   In response to the communication dated 12/21/2004, claims 1-2, 5-10, 12, and 14-33 are

pending in this office action as the results of the cancellation of claims 3-4, 11 and 13.

2.   This application claims priority to Provisional Application No. 60286259 filed on April

24, 2001 and No. 60254298 filed on December 8, 2000.

3. Acknowledges

3.   Receipt is acknowledged of the following items from the Applicant:

The applicant's amendments dated 12/21/2004 have been considered and made of record.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections

set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

4.   Claims 1-2, 5-10, and 23-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Wilson (US 6,460,031), in view of Korda (US 6,564,210).

Regarding claims 1-7, 9 and 29-32, Wilson discloses a method for formulation of queries

for use in accessing information from a knowledge base (See col. 2, line 55-67), said method

comprising:

(a) displaying a first menu list of words or phrases (See col. 3, lines 1-3);

(b) receiving a first selection of at least one of the words or phrases in the first menu list

(See col. 3, lines 1-5);

Wilson is silent as to receiving user profile information associated with a user formulating the

queries. On the other hand Korda teaches receiving user profile information associated with a

user formulating the queries (See col. 22, lines 39-44, Korda et al.). It would have been obvious

to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to formulate queries

based on user profile information as suggested by Korda. The motivation would have been to

provide relevant results to users based on user focus of interest (See col. 22, lines 4-35, Korda et

al.).

> (d) obtaining a second menu list of words or phrases based on the first selection of at
>
> least one of the words or phrases in the first menu list (See col. 3, lines 5-10, Wilson et
>
> al.). And, the combination of Wilson and Korda suggests obtaining a second menu list of
>
> words or phrases based on the user profile information so that focusing on user interest
>
> by applying user profile information.
>
> (e) receiving a second selection of at least one of the words or phrases in the second
>
> menu list (See col. 5, lines 53-60).
>
> (f) formulating a query from at least the first selection and the second selection (See col.
>
> 6, lines 20-44) as per claims 9.

wherein said obtaining (c) comprises dynamically generating the second menu list based on the

first selection of at least one of the words or phrases in the first menu list (See col. 3, line 4-5) as

per claims 2, 7, and 30.

wherein the query is a natural language phrase, sentence or question (See col. 2, lines 65-67, and col. 6, lines 39-44) as per claims 5-6 and 31-32.

Regarding claim 8, Wilson/Korda discloses said obtaining (c) comprises selecting the second menu list from a plurality of predetermined menu lists based on the first selection of at least one of the words or phrases in the first menu list (See Fig. 4, and col. 5, lines 39-60, Wilson et al.).

Regarding claim 10, Wilson/Korda discloses (f) displaying the query produced by said formulating (e) (618, Fig. 6, Wilson et al.).

Regarding claim 33, Wilson/Korda discloses whereby the phrase, sentence or question is form through menu selections of words or phrases and thus without having to enter individual characters therefor (See Fig. 4, and col. 5, lines 39-60, Wilson et al.).

Regarding claim 23, Wilson/Korda discloses a method for retrieving information from a knowledge base for a user, said method comprising:

(a) constructing a natural language query from a series of user word or phrase menu selections, the series of user word or phrase menu selections being associated with a series of menus that are presented to user (See Figs. 4, 5, 6, and col. 5, line 39 to col. 6, line 44, Wilson et al.), and a user profile associated with the user as addressed above in claim 1;

(b) processing the natural language query to obtain a response from the knowledge base

(See col. 6, line 57 to col. 7, line 15, Wilson et al.); and

(c) displaying the response to the user (See col. 7, lines 15-16, Wilson et al.).

Regarding claims 24 and 26, Wilson/Korda discloses a method for retrieving pertinent

information from a data source for a user, said method comprising:

(a) displaying an initial menu of words or phrases (See col. 5, lines 61-54, Wilson et al.);

(b) receiving an initial user menu selection of at least one of the words or phrases of the

initial menu (See col. 5, lines 64-66, Wilson et al.);

(c) obtaining a subsequent menu of words or phrases based on the s initial user menu

selection (See col. 5, line 66 to col. 6, line 2, Wilson et al.) and user profile information

associated with the user as addressed above in claim 1;

(d) displaying the subsequent menu of words or phrases(See col. 5, line 66 to col. 6, line

2, Wilson et al.);

(e) receiving a subsequent user menu selection of at least one of the words or phrases of

the subsequent menu (See col. 6, lines 2-3, Wilson et al.);

(f) displaying an initial query in accordance with at least the to subsequent user menu

selection (See col. 4, lines 42-49, also Fig. 6, and col. 6, line17-44, Wilson et al.);

(g) determining whether additional user menu selections are desired or needed (See Col.

6, lines 17-44, Wilson et al.);

(h) repeating said obtaining (c) through said displaying (f) until said determining (g)

determines that no additional user menu selections are is desired or needed, wherein an updated

query is displayed by said displaying (f) in accordance with at least the plurality of the

subsequent user menu selections (See 618, Fig. 6, and Col. 7, lines 9-15, Wilson et al.);

(i) obtaining a response to the updated query (See Col. 7, lines 9-15, Wilson et al.); and

(j) presenting and displaying the response to the user (See col. 7, lines 15-16, Wilson et

al.).

Regarding claim 25, Wilson/Korda discloses wherein said obtaining (i) comprises:

(i1) forming a request for the response to the updated query (See col. 7, lines 9-

14, Wilson et al.);

(i2) transmitting the request to a remote server from which the response is

obtained (See col. 7, lines 13-15, Wilson et al.); and

(i3) receiving the response from the remote server (See col. 7, lines 15-16, Wilson

et al.).

Regarding claim 27, Wilson/Korda discloses wherein the words or phrases in the initial

menu are concepts (See Fig. 6, Wilson et al.).

Regarding claim 28, Wilson/Korda discloses wherein the initial query and the updated

query are natural language queries (See col. 2, lines 65-67, and col. 6, lines 39-44, Wilson et al.).

5.   Claims 12 and 14-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Wilson (US 6,460,031), in view of Korda (US 6,564,210), and further in view of DeLorme (US

5,948,040).

Regarding claims 12, 17, and 19, Wilson, in view of Korda, discloses all the claimed

subject matter as set forth above in claims 1-5. However, Wilson/Korda is silent as to use a

mobile computing device to operate the method of claims 1-5. On the other hand, DeLorme

discloses a mobile computing device using menus to generate queries (See 907, Fig. 9B, and col.

71, line 61 to col. 72, lines 3, and also see the abstract, DeLorme et al.). Since Wilson/Korda

uses computer system to operate the method of formulating queries using menus. It would have

been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to

include a mobile computing device in the system of Wilson/Korda. The motivation would have

been to enhance the flexibility and convenience of the system so that the system can be used

anywhere. Wilson/Korda further discloses wherein the user word or phrase menu selections with

respect to earlier of the menus of the series of menus affects the particular words or phrases in

subsequent of the menus of the series of menus (See Fig. 6, Wilson et al.)

Regarding claim 14, Wilson/Korda/DeLorme discloses wherein the one or more phrases,

sentences or questions being constructed by said constructing (b) are natural language phrases,

sentences or questions (See col. 2, lines 65-67, and col. 6, lines 39-44, Wilson et al.).

Regarding claim 15, Wilson/Korda/DeLorme discloses (c) displaying the one or more

phrases, sentences or questions from said constructing (b) (See col. 4, lines 42-49, also Fig. 6,

and col. 6, line17-44, Wilson et al.);

Regarding claim 16, Wilson/Korda/DeLorme discloses wherein said displaying (c)

operates to incrementally update the one or more phrases, sentences or questions being displayed

as each of the series of user word or phrase menu selections are individually made (See col. 7,

lines 9-15, Wilson et al.).

Regarding claim 18, Wilson/Korda/DeLorme discloses wherein at least adjacent ones of

the menus in the series of menus have a grammatical and/or contextual relationship (See Fig. 4,

Wilson et al.).

Regarding claim 20, Wilson/Korda/DeLorme discloses wherein said constructing (b)

operates to construct the one or more phrases, sentences or questions based on the series of user

word or phrase menu selections and based on one or more of user selection history, user

preferences, content or application (See col. 5, lines 1-10, Wilson et al.).

Regarding claim 21, Wilson/Korda/DeLorme discloses wherein the series of menus are

predetermined (See col. 5, lines 42-60, Wilson et al.).

Regarding claim 22. Wilson/Korda/DeLorme discloses wherein a plurality of the menus

in the series of menus are dynamically determined in response to menu selections (See col. 3,

line 4-5, Wilson et al.).

Response to Arguments

6.   Applicant's arguments filed on 12/21/2004 about the claim rejection of the last Office

Action have been fully considered, but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

The applicant argue that Wilson does not teach a system in which user profile

information is used to obtain a second menu list of words or phrases as amended. The Examiner

respectfully points out that it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at

the time of the invention was made to use a user profile information for obtaining list of words or

phrases as suggested by Korda as addressed above.

Conclusion

7.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

8.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Merilyn P Nguyen whose telephone number is 571-272-4026. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F: 8:30 - 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Safet Metjahic can be reached on 571-272-4023. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9306 for regular communications and 703-746-7240 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

MN
April 29, 2005

FRANTZ COBY
PRIMARY EXAMINER